



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

F

130

D9

W91

A 404479

Woodward  
The deutsch in Albany  
1900.

Univ. of Mich.

---

---

*GENERAL LIBRARY of the*  
*UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN*

---

---

—PRESENTED BY—

*Prof. Demmon*

*m.d.*

F  
130  
.D9  
W91



7-10  
RESPONSE OF

HON. JOHN WOODWARD,

JUSTICE SUPREME COURT, NEW YORK STATE.

TO THE TOAST,

“THE DUTCH IN ALBANY AND THE  
DUTCH IN SOUTH AFRICA,”

114977

AT THE DINNER OF

The Albany Society,

AT

DELMONICO'S, NEW YORK CITY.

January 10th, 1900.



## THE DUTCH IN ALBANY, AND THE DUTCH IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Mr. Toastmaster and Gentlemen of the Albany Society:

10-16-91  
We celebrate tonight a historic triumph. News has just come by way of South Africa that the Dutch have taken Holland--and I know that you will rejoice with me because of this unlooked for event. There will also be rejoicing on the other side when the Hollanders learn that the Dutch have retaken New York---and that New Amsterdam has been rehabilitated by the descendants of the Patroons! The descent from Albany, it seems, has been the cause of a rise in Dutch courage---for all around me I hear the ominous uncorking of bottled valor, and the cheerful effervescence of good spirits; but this is by no means surprising. What else is to be expected at a Dutch dinner? Nor when I consider your well known capacity, do I consider it likely that the sign of this tavern---which I am told is "In the Half Moon" shall ever be changed to read "In the Full Moon."

11-14-91  
Sons of Fort Orange, and Albanians, all hail to the Dutch that is in you! for assuredly the Dutch are coming into their own! The Rip Van Winkle sleep of two centuries has at last been broken and a rejuvenated people wakes to heroic youth, and springs to glorious action.

11-14-91  
The race so long accused by the British of wasting its slow energies in building beaver dams, has diverted its quick powers to the production of dams to English aggression, and it is a diversion that the English do not seem to be very fond of, either! It seems indeed to have had a rather depressing effect, for an Englishman no longer spells great God



with a little "g" or puts capital "M" for his mighty "me." Tulips threaten to become more popular than roses, and Dutch Orange may soon supplant the British red! The forgotten edicts of the canons of Dort, are once more thundered from the cannons of Transvaal---and their echoes encircle the world with applause. Gentlemen---the Boers! Your cousins and my friends!

You English speaking men of Dutch descent---gathered here to celebrate a Dutch departure and an American arrival ---I now ask to turn with me to our Dutch antipodes in South Africa. For there a drama is being enacted whose climax may a century hence receive the commemoration of some such celebration as this---when the descendants of the Knickerbockers of South Africa perhaps shall meet to celebrate discovery and conquest---revolution---and the birth of statehood---since grown to perfect national form. And concerning this small but mighty race, these iron-sides of Transvaal, and Spartans of the Twentieth Century; this people so strong in reserve and indomitable in spirit, I am asked to say a few words:

To those of us who are not of Dutch descent, and who are far enough away from English ancestors to look at the complicated checker-board of the South African situation with eyes unblinded by prejudice and with hearts unquicken-ed by passion---to contemplate it not with the ardour of the advocate, but with the coldness of a judge, the war now being waged for British or Dutch supremacy is full of interesting study! A study of statecraft and of races, significant in many ways---consequential in every respect.

I personally believe that the question now to be settled by the sword strikes deeper than the superficial subterfuge that has asked for its solution would lead us to believe. Let us, however, consider this subject dispassionately---free from prejudice, and impartially. Let not the fact of our descent cause us to look at either side with favor; let not the identity

of blood, nor the similarity of language and of institutions, blind us to the true points at issue here. It is not race, it is not creed—it is not tongue that shall determine our attitude—it is justice.

Have you not read the magnificent struggle of the first Boer settlers—and of their battle against the wild beasts, and the wilder savages of that awful African wilderness? Have you not read how the usurper drove them back—back from their own blood-bought acres—into the untrodden fastnesses beyond? And one abiding place after another, they were forced to leave in the hands of their oppressor—till they trekked across the Vaal—and here, between the Orange and Limpopo—upon those sterile heights—the noble ten thousand made their last stand against encroachment—here in this territory which Great Britain then thought not worth the coveting. I ask you again, have you read all this—and not been struck by the parallel of your own ancestors, whose struggles and privations, whose triumphs and achievements, we celebrate tonight in cheer and plenty, and all brotherly love. Do not let the prosaic nearness of the Boer war blind our eyes to the poetry of their struggle, which is no less grand than that of your own Dutch forefathers. Such, I think will be the judgment of posterity; for a United States of South Africa will be the inevitable corollary of this conflict—as a United States of America was the direct consequence of the injustice of British paramountcy in the Thirteen Colonies. But you say the injustice of the latter was proven—that of British Imperialism in Africa is an open question. The verdicts of history are not always just and impartial. How often, indeed, are they based upon the argument of result—it happened thus, and therefore it was so and so. Had the sons of the Knickerbockers, who opened so humbly at Lexington and who closed so triumphantly at Yorktown, fought disastrously, who of us would point with pride to his rebel ancestor—now called patriot in the nomen-

clature of success? The American questions of 1776 were no less the subject of agitation and the cause of differences of opinion among wise and grave men, than are the questions now propounded from the mouth of cannon in South Africa. No---we must contemplate the matter in the light of reason alone. Results have not yet come trooping with overwhelming cogency to force our judgment to the admission that success and justice are united in fact.

When England, in 1795, by the fortune of war, was ceded the barren Cape---its tiny Dutch town and outlying Boer hamlets, did the simple inhabitants of this land---a land self-chosen, self-discovered, and self-developed---have any voice in the making of the treaty that gave them another sovereign? Assuredly not---and yet surely this was the worst form of taxation without representation---to be taxed with a sovereign, and to have no part in his selection!

When in 1806--as a result of the war with France, whose imperial banners, the standards of little Holland had been forced to join, England again received the territory ceded back in 1803---the Boers once more had bestowed upon them a citizenship that they did not desire and a fatherland that they repudiated. And though Holland did relinquish her rights in South Africa for a pecuniary consideration, the Afrianders themselves had no voice in the matter. So, from the very start, those obstinate old Dutchmen had every reason to dislike British rule, and when John Bull arrogantly began to abridge their rough hewn liberties, they determined to seek their freedom in the unruled desert, and founded, in the course of a half century, the Transvaal.

We have not the time here to go into the early history of the Republic. We know that its full independence was granted in 1852---that in 1877 this independence was unjustly taken away, and that in the treaty of 1881 a claim of British suzerainty was set up which had its apparent justification in the defenseless condition of the infant republic. This

treaty was never ratified by the Volksraad, and was very unpopular with the Boers. Kruger and two other commissioners were sent to England to demand the repeal of the offensive article containing the word suzerainty. And by the London Convention of 1884, this fossilized principle of the Middle Ages, was pronounced dead by both parties. It was thought so surely by the Volksraad of the Transvaal, without whose approval that convention had no efficacy. It was thought so by the English ratifiers—who well knew that the chief and sole purpose of the three Transvaal Commissioners was to secure the recognition of the full independence of Transvaal.

And now this corpse, this dead word “suzerainty,” has been revived to justify the designs of a monster conspiracy—to overturn the whole fabric of the Boer republic—to secure the control of its valuable gold mines, and to annex its territory—“by the grace of God” to the British Crown.

Nor are any of the signs of conspiracy wanting here. Let us thresh out the last straw in the claim of suzerainty. First, let us not lose sight of the established feudal rule that where the superiority of one of two politically related parties or states is disputed by the other, this superiority is considered as not existing until proved by the party or state claiming it. Let us also not forget the fact that the Transvaal had almost forgotten that such claim had ever been made by England, and that England herself for fifteen years treated such claim as dead. And it was dead till the rapid and unexpected growth of Transvaal suddenly called it back to life. Let us, however, for the sake of argument, consider this alleged suzerainty as existing. In feudal law the rights of the vassal are no less definite than those of the suzerain—and no less to be respected—and the first right of the vassal is the right of protection; for the superiority necessarily included in the term “suzerainty” brings with it the parallel duty of protection. When, therefore, a suzerain attacks, or permits

to be attacked, the vassal whom it is his sworn duty to protect so long as he shall assume the dignity of suzerain, the bond between the two is forever destroyed, and the vassal has full liberty to dispose of himself as he may see fit. He may seek a new suzerain, or he may be suzerain on his own account, and a law to himself. This was the alternative chosen by Transvaal, when England's Colonial Secretary--a representative part of her government--aided by the Prime Minister of Cape Colony, ordered, permitted or connived at the Jameson raid! Allowing the claim of suzerainty in its entirety---according to all law and reason, it fell when Chamberlain and Rhodes connived at (we shall use the mildest term) the invasion of Transvaal by a band of English marauders. If they were guiltless, why was Jameson's punishment so incommensurate with his crime. Why were so many telegrams destroyed and concealed from the scrutiny of an enquiring world? Why were so many pivotal witnesses at the trial spirited away; why is the promised compensation still unpaid---why?---why? Answer me, you who would defend them? One thing is certain---they knew that the raid was probable---was being prepared, and took no pains to prevent it. It agreed too well with the trend of Imperial policy---the policy that so often tramples justice in the dust and crushes right with an iron heel. I repeat, they knew it and could have prevented it---and this gross failure in the performance of the duties of a suzerain, at once relieved the alleged vassal of all allegiance, and gave him the right to protect himself. And this was and is the position of Transvaal. Chamberlain, himself, made forever void his fondest claim. Suzerainty is dead beyond resurrection, and the international lawyer who would attempt the impossible task of revivification, would be laughed out of the Court of the Nations as a political mountebank.

In view of the thousand and one incidents that are the links of a palpable conspiracy, recently made manifest by

the broad admissions of several of the most important conspirators---in view of practices so grossly dishonorable as the suppression by English envoys of important passages in documents containing Boer concessions. I repeat---in view of all these evidences of bad faith on the part of the British representatives, can the Boers be blamed for manifesting so much caution and distrust? Can they be censured for choosing the only alternative left them---war? What else was there to do when the mercenaries of imperialism were speeding towards them---to compass their destruction---when regiment after regiment was massing on their frontier---when menace shown in every English soldier's face, and when the foremost English statesman had publicly doomed them to political dissolution---and all this because they disowned a suzerainty that, even if it existed, had been rendered null and void by the neglectful and threatening policy of their presuming suzerain.

England has all along been most unsympathetic and has never attempted any conciliation---has made no concessions save those extorted from her by Boer successes. At no time has she had a *de jure* right to the allegiance of the Boers---and by the treaty of 1884 she alone retained the power to veto treaties with any other foreign government, save the Orange Free State---while the Transvaal not only obtained entire and unrestricted control over internal affairs, but also received the power to accredit diplomatic representatives to foreign courts. If the Transvaal did not then become a sovereign state, why did Great Britain at once substitute a Consul for the Resident who had represented her before? A Resident is only sent to a dependency; a Consul is accredited only to a sovereign state. This fact is most significant. It is a standing refutation of Chamberlain's claim. Mr. Chamberlain, himself, in a dispatch, called the Transvaal a "foreign state." And yet the London press speaks of the "Boer revolt."

But the ministers of her Majesty's government were well aware of the weakness of their claim--and, therefore, that they might hide its imperfections from the multitude, and cover its nakedness, they resorted to a wily subterfuge, and made the additional claim "paramountcy."

It seems, to judge from the events of the last few years, that as long as the Boers were few and poor, England did not object to the acknowledgment of their independence, but as soon as they became richer and more important, she found it necessary to question and to imperil this independence in every way. This is as true of the Orange Free State as it is of the Transvaal.

In 1848 England forcibly took the territory of the Free State from the Boer immigrants, whom they ruthlessly shot down. When, in 1854, England found the country useless and unprofitable and saw that the Aborigines were a source of much trouble and of little gain, she left it as she found it in the hands of the Boers.

And thus 500 Boers were left alone in that vast wilderness, surrounded by myriads of Kaffirs---500 Boers struggling for existence, where the English, themselves, thought existence without the protection of 2,000 armed men, impossible. And now the English Ministers affirm that they graciously gave the Free State to the Boers.

The Convention, which gave the Free State independence, also contained several articles which England soon found it convenient to ignore. She had promised never to interfere with the Kaffirs north of the Orange river, and also to allow the importation of arms and ammunition---without which the Boers would have been utterly helpless.

When the Boers of the Free State became engaged in a boundary war with the Basutos, England suddenly forbade them from transporting powder through English ports ---apparently desiring, by thus withholding this necessary means of protection, the destruction of the little Republic.

About 1870 the diamond fields of the Free State were discovered, and it was not long before England found a pretext to annex them. England, indeed, promised a compensation of 90,000 pounds---90,000 pounds for mines whose annual yield is 15,000,000 pounds! And the 90,000 pounds still remain to be paid. Of the taking of these mines, Sir Arthur Cunynhame, Commander-in-Chief of the British forces, said: "It is downright robbery, and every English gentleman feels ashamed of it."

And when Sir Alfred Milner recently began to assert England's suzerainty also over the Free State, what remained for her to do save to cast in her lot with the Transvaal?

And thus arose this war. Is it not a magnificent spectacle, this struggle of an infant race of 300,000 people against an overgrown and gigantic empire of 300,000,000? This small band of patriots headed by the immortal Kruger stands guard at the Thermopylae of Africander civilization, guarding their country's liberties against the hordes of unrighteousness!

What a splendid appeal, that of the Secretary of the South African Republic: "Brother Africanders---The great day has come. The God of our fathers will fight with us---the Lord, whose arm is not shortened, for He will help those who seek Him in their extremity. Let us not put our trust in Princes, but raise our eyes devoutly to God, our banner. By Him we shall perform great deeds---Even as mighty Spain with its bloodthirsty Alva and its invincible Armada, was humbled in the dust, so, too, will the Lord deliver them into our hands."

"The sword of Gideon, sword of God,  
Be with ye, Boers. Brave men of peace,  
Ye hewed the path, ye brake the sod,  
Ye fed white flocks of fat increase,  
Where Saxon foot had never trod;

10.15.16



Where Saxon feet unto this day  
 Had measured not, had never known  
 Had ye not bravely led the way,  
 And made such happy home your own.

I think God's house must be such home  
 The priestess mother's choristers  
 Who spin and weave, nor care to roam  
 Beyond this white God's house of hers,  
 But spinning sing, and spin again,  
 I think such silent shepherd men  
 Most like that few the prophet sings---  
 Most like that few stout Abram drew  
 Triumphant o'er the slaughtered Kings.

Defend God's house! Let fall the crook,  
 Draw forth the plowshare from the sod  
 And trust, as in the Holy Book  
 The sword of Gideon and of God:---  
 God and the right! Enough to fight  
 A million regiments of wrong.  
 Defend! nor count what comes of it.  
 God's battle bides not with the strong;  
 Her pride must fall. So it is writ!

Her gold, her grace, how staunch she fares!  
 Fame's wine cup pressing her proud lips---  
 Her checkerboard of battle squares  
 Rimmed round by steel-belt battleships!  
 And yet meanwhile ten thousand miles  
 She seeks ye out. Well, welcome her!  
 Give her such welcome with such will  
 As Boston gave in battle's whir  
 That red, dread day, at Bunker Hill."

W. W. L.

But, I hear some one say, "What about the franchise?" There seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding about this matter, and after a thorough study of the situation, I am convinced that the great outcry made by the Uitlanders was much ado about nothing. Why should Chamberlain make the alleged refusal of the Transvaal to decrease the period of probation for full citizenship from fourteen to five years, a *casus belli*, when in old England herself, a period of twelve years is required before the foreigner can cast a ballot for a member of the House of Commons. And not even a native Englishman can vote for a member of the First British Chamber, the House of Lords! That would be an unheard of innovation, and perhaps a century from now the Boers of the United States of South Africa will have to introduce this extraordinary privilege---demanded, it may be, by some of their own countrymen residing in England.

Is naturalization a birthright? What statesman would advocate so dangerous a political doctrine? An easy suffrage is apt to be a national decensus Averni. Our own country has often felt the blight of a too free franchise. But what is England's record?

Cape Colony was a Crown dependency a half century before anyone had the right of ballot. How many of the taxed citizens of British India have a right to vote for their representatives? After England had annexed the Transvaal, from 1877 to 1881, did she give her new subjects---the Boers---the much desired ballot? No, she did not. Yet she extorted taxes far more unjust than those of the Republic. And in Rhodesia, today---where also there are thousands of English citizens and Uitlanders, there has been no provision made for the franchise. There are in fact, millions of Englishmen now without the right of ballot---and has electoral reform in England been of such rapid growth that Englishmen have the right to manifest such aggressive impatience at the slowness of another country.

It is also significant that there are 5,000 Englishmen in Transvaal who have the right of franchise---and who have never shown any desire to make use of the privilege. And yet the cause of the war, it is asserted, was the length of time that must elapse before the Uitlanders could be admitted to full citizenship---a question in which England had as much right to interfere in Transvaal as she would have under similar circumstances, in the United States. And though the Boers offered to reduce the time of probation from 14 years to five, yet England would not be satisfied, and only replied by increasing her troops on the Transvaal frontiers from 5,000 to 25,000. Was any other ultimatum save war possible to the threatened Republic?

Many new elements have come to swell the country's population--elements both desirable and otherwise--and these diverse elements have not yet had time to be assimilated. Sixty thousand crimes were committed in Johannesburg last year. This is a sufficient commentary. A hundred and sixty thousand strangers---some few healthy, substantial business men, and hordes of diseased and unprincipled adventurers came into Johannesburg alone during the last ten years, and it is safe to say that not more than 500 of these ever had the remotest idea of becoming burghers of the Republic. It was the gold of Transvaal that lured them into those wilds and they intended, almost to a man, when this thirst was satisfied, to shake the dust of Africa from their feet. The inconsistency of the Uitlander's demand is furthermore shown by the fact that the English, by far the greater part of the foreign population, desired the right of citizenship without forswearing their allegiance to the queen.

In view of the circumstances and conditions, is it strange that President Kruger refused to let down the safeguards of the Republic? Was not his caution its salvation?

As to the excessive taxes, they are and were *pro rata*, and are less than at Kimberley, a British mining town. The

average tax on the profits of the mines is only two and a half per cent. The Transvaal mining laws are admitted to be the best in the world. Many of the great companies pay only a thousand dollars on the million in the gross, and the Boers are taxed as much as the Uitlanders. Though corruption has been charged, and this, too, in high places, it has not been proven. If it had been true, we surely would have heard charges more specific. Abuses there have been; but they exist also in free England, and in great America. Could we expect otherwise in a new country like the Transvaal---with a heterogeneous and restless population living amid untried conditions and an ever varying environment. The Uitlander complains that elsewhere in South Africa, only two or three years' qualification for the franchise is required. Why should it take so much longer in Transvaal? Because there alone the new citizens were becoming far more numerous than the old ones, and the admission to full citizenship after two years' residence---as it was formerly---would mean a complete surrender of political control. As the newcomers were radically different in tastes, habits, religion and language, is it surprising that the Boers---who had wrested the country from savagery and had won it with their blood---neglected no constitutional safeguard for their own preservation? No wonder that they repulsed every innovation that threatened their existence as a nation. The granting of the English demands would have been the suicide of the Transvaal Republic. It is surely to the credit of these old Dutchmen that they did not force matters. They have avoided all haste and have met each difficulty as it came up---and wisely have they acted. They have attempted to settle these matters even as the English themselves have settled them---gradually and tentatively---and yet they have been blamed by the English for their empirical methods and judicial attitude---an inconsistency, only to be explained by the dictates of an unscrupulous expediency. But for the Jameson raid,

the whole question might have been settled amicably. This blunder intensified the hatred between the two races and discouraged the talented and progressive men among the Boers who had long been working to bring about a reconciliation. Did not 25,000 bona fide Uitlanders sign a petition saying these question could be settled amicably?

But they speak of taxation without representation. Shades of Machiavelli! Does not the foreigner in both England and America pay his share of the taxes. Does he not largely contribute to the national treasury? And yet he has no vote until he is naturalized.

Are not the unrepresented women of England and America taxed? Are not thousands of poor men in England annually disenfranchised because it is impossible for them to conform to the excluding anomalies of the registration laws?

No, "franchise" is the catchword to tickle the long ears of the crowd, and "paramountcy" is the sugar-coated pill prepared for the public palate—but the slow poison concealed within will do its deadly work no less because of the sweetness of the dose. The lust for dominion and the greed for gold: These are the passions now flaming into the blaze of unholy battle.

Most of the Uitlander grievances have been manufactured in Downing Street---by Chamberlain & Company---compounded to suit the needs of the hour, and to give the color of right to a long-determined unrighteous policy, and a deep-laid infernal plan. The Republics are in the way of Imperial Confederation, and must be destroyed---and right is invoked to conceal a wrong. But England has annexed so many little states in the same high-handed way, stifling objections with gold, and silencing protests with powder, that it has produced a moral atrophy in the British conscience that if not soon overcome, will result in national degeneracy and political decay. England's policy seems to be this: Treaties with equals are sacred; treaties with weaker states

are made to be broken, at the first suggestion of advantage. English "fair play" has become a mockery and a mirth-provoking farce. Mammon has been placed on the pedestal where Justice sat enthroned.

British public speech of late has truly been used to conceal intentions and to divert suspicion. Believing that a regiment of liars is more powerful than an army of bayonets, England has long valiantly waged a campaign of deception that once promised to be triumphant. Kruger, however, unexpectedly threw down the gauntlet and the British were forced to change their subtle tactics for the harsher argument of war. But their reasoning so far has not proved very cogent, and the Boers are still unconvinced!

Wars are no longer decreed in the cabinets of Kings. The thunder bolts of modern battle are made out of gold, and forged in the vaults of the Stock Exchange! The Boers have ever stood between the two horns of a painful dilemma---"Choose," says John Bull---with the point of a bayonet at the throat of the pigmy who has dared to defy him---"Choose the fear of god or the fear of Me---choose---your old-fashioned virtue or my new fangled vice."

Gentlemen, they tell us the Boers are non-progressive, and that British Paramountcy stands for civilization. Let us look into this matter: Let us compare Kimberley, a British possession, with Johanensburg. Each for fifteen or twenty years has had all the benefits of an unrestricted development along national lines. Let us see how far the Boers have retarded Johannesburg, and how far the British have developed Kimberley:

Johannesburg with its hospitals, churches, schools, and its other public institutions, in respect to the advantages of civilization, compares very favorably with any city of its size in the world. Kimberley is bare of convenience and almost destitute of the advantages of civilization. Kimberley had to wait fifteen years for its first railroad, and ten years for its

telegraph. Johannesburg was well furnished with both two years after the city was founded.

Kimberley, notwithstanding the fact that \$75,000,000 worth of diamonds are extracted there yearly, is the deadest town in South Africa. And yet it would have been no less flourishing and progressive than Johannesburg, had it not been for the consolidation effected by the mine owners, which has frozen out all competition and reduced all enterprise to a dead level. True, the Boer government of Johannesburg is so non-progressive that it does not allow the mine owners to work the mines on the compound system that has been used to such wonderful advantage at Kimberley. Do you know what the compound system is? The natives are forced to remain near the pit of the mines in cabins surrounded by a high wall—a sort of stockade—and here they live and move and have their being, during the few hours when they are not working in the mines. But you must understand that it is only their personal liberty that is restrained, and it is for their own good. They are not slaves; for slavery cannot exist under the British flag—and it is the British flag that now waves over Kimberley, waves where the ensign of the Free State waved before. And so the miners are protected for their own good, and for the good of the Diamond Industry. And yet the Boers—whose hard heartedness is now so well known—thanks to the British papers—will not allow the compound system in the Rand. They obstinately refuse to profit by the example of Kimberley. No wonder the capitalists are furious with such non-progressiveness; and the money magnates, animated by the ethics of the Stock Exchange, have begun this holy war to compel these “rude peasants” with their antiquated virtues and superannuated ideals to conform to the methods prevailing at Kimberley. What an outrage that the helots of Johannesburg are free to work or not as they will—that they can do just as they please—that they can take their own holidays and fix their own

conditions of labor---that they can have access to every form of amusement---that they can have perfect liberty of speech---that they are able to earn three times as much as they can even in free old England? How primitive this is to be sure! And yet those stupid Cornish miners refused to sign that famous petition to the Queen which aired the Uitlander grievances and recounted the details of their awful fate.

And how does the government of Cape Colony compare with the government of the Transvaal? The Cape has a debt of thirty million pounds, and almost half of the Colony is hypothecated, while the boasted franchise is so valuable that votes are offered daily in the municipal market! Have not even English writers described the English Cape government as a general system of corruption---unparalleled in the very worst days of the rule of the Dutch East India Co.? And even in regard to the politically-gifted English, Mr. Labouchere recently said: "I can point to financial abuses in England as great as any in Transvaal."

Did not Lord Russell paint a picture of the rottenness which is prevalent in all circles of English life. I do not mean to arraign the land of my ancestors. England is a great and glorious country---no other land, perhaps, has done as much for progress---but facts are facts, and the truth must be spoken. Surely the Boers have some reason to resent the statement that British Paramountcy means civilization! And it is significant that in this wrangle and disputation, the Orange Free State has never been accused of corruption and of the other things that form the basis of the Uitlander grievances. It is significant, I repeat, because the government of the Free State is entirely in the hands of the Boers---the same people that control the Transvaal. It is said that no purer government exists than that of the Free State. Does this not show that the Transvaal Boers have been forced into their seemingly narrow and illiberal policy by the pressure of circumstance, and for their own protection from



the unceasing plots of the conspiring Uitlanders? How could they admit those to citizenship who had worked night and day for the overthrow of their cherished independence? The fact is that the Boers of the Transvaal are just as honest, and capable as their brothers of the Free State, but a deluge of adventurers and a flood of vices have caused them to take the attitude of self-preservation! And yet even in Transvaal there is as great liberty of person--as great freedom of speech and of the press as in any other country in the world--and it cannot be proven that the Uitlanders have not equal privileges and equal civil rights before the law with the Boers themselves! Why, the very time Chamberlain declared goods and chattels unsafe in Transvaal, fifteen million dollars were invested by Englishmen, and the chartered company prepared for extensive investments.

The majority of the Boers are today poorer than they were before gold was discovered---when they got better prices for their products. Then, too, labor was much cheaper and game much more abundant, so it is apparent that the statement that the Boers in general have been enriched at the expense of the Uitlander, needs some qualification. The true question is not what are the grievances of the Uitlanders---who annually take scores of millions out of the country, but what are the wrongs of the impoverished, maligned and threatened Boers?

Gentlemen, England appeals to America in behalf of the Anglo-Saxons. She would lure us into an alliance that would benefit her alone. But the Boers also are Anglo-Saxon---as pure as the English---and England seeks the friendship of one part of the Anglo-Saxon race, while she is offering up another part on the altar of her greed. The Boers are the true Anglo-Saxons---true to the spirit of their race.

But the Boers are Barbarians? Do we not constantly read of "Boer atrocities?" Why, you remember their harsh

Not!

treatment of the Blacks by refusing to mix with them! Have you forgotten how they treated poor Jameson and his noble band of political martyrs? And only the other day the English papers were full of their outrages to their British prisoners, taken in one of the recent battles. I saw a letter from one of these Englishmen, who after casually mentioning that he had been given a new clean bed, a suit of neat underwear, and among other toilet articles, a toothbrush, complained that the suit of clothes the Boers had given him was not tailor-made.

True, the Boers---a primitive pastoral people, like the old Puritans of America and your sturdy old Dutch forefathers---are stern and severe. Perhaps they did commit some cruelties in their wars with the overwhelming and bloodthirsty natives. Froude, the most accurate and reliable of modern English historians, speaks of their stern attributes, where, after comparing the Boers to the Roman peasant soldiers who defeated Pyrrhus and Hannibal, he says:

“There alone you will find obedience to parents as strict as among the ancient Sabines, the *Severa mater*, whose sons fetch and carry at her bidding, who when these sons go to fight for their country, will hand their rifles to them and bid them return with their arms in their hands---or else not return at all.

They rule after their own pattern. They forbid idleness and indiscriminate vagrancy. There have been no risings of Blacks against Whites in the Transvaal. Authority has been sustained without panics and without severity. Such scenes as the destruction of Tangola Bebele’s tribe in Natal, or the massacre at Koegus, which disgraced the Cape Colony in 1878, had never been paralleled in the Dutch Independent States.” Froude personally paid a visit to South Africa to study the conditions there. Shall we believe him ---Froude, the Englishman?

We know the despair of a disenchantment.. We mourn an illusion lost, and a shattered ideal! England, so long the champion of freedom and the advance guard of civilization, has fallen from the pedestal of our admiration, and lies in all of her corrupt nakedness, the theme of the scorner. Chamberlain and Chauvinism, these are the twin steeds of perdition that are whirling the British Empire to destruction. Is it possible that England's so-called humanizing policy, and her boasted civilizing mission has been nothing after all but colossal hypocrisy and gigantic selfishness---whose foul face is now for the first time entirely unmasked? For what, if not hypocritical, is Chamberlain's immaculate conception of a resurrected suzerainty? What else is the long story of a deferred suffrage? What is the British policy but squatter sovereignty? It is the old story of Naboth's Vineyard and a covetous king over again!

O! England of the Magna Charta---political Utopia of our youthful dreams---land of homes and the country of personal freedom, where every man's "house is his castle"---how is thy glory fallen among the nations! O! England of Hampden---Apostle of Peace---whose sword only a few months ago seemed about to be sheathed forever in splendid inaction, what is now thy attitude before the world?

The Peace Conference had hardly adjourned when this foremost advocate of peace and the first reviler of war, began the good work, which it had made its self-chosen mission, by this most unrighteous of modern wars---a war universally deprecated---a war pronounced inexcusable by Harcourt and Labouchere, Morley, Bryce, Sir Edward Clarke, and many other able English statesmen.

It is the right of nationality---the first of all rights---the collective rights of an aspiring majority---that is the inspiration of the Africander! And Transvaal, as well as Holland, its European model, shall never relinquish its ideal. Like the United States, its American prototype also, it shall not

be diverted from attainment by fear or force. If the right of nationality be the highest right, is not the wrong of denationalization the lowest of wrongs?

Mr. Chamberlain himself admitted that nine-tenths of the Uitlander demands had been ceded---was the other tenth worth the precious lives it costs? Answer me, ye heartbroken mothers of England? Chamberlain may obtain his tithes, but they will be the tithes of tears and the burden of blood.

"There can be no mechanical union," as Froude said, "between the mother-country and her dependencies." The only bond that is truly and ever-binding, is the bond of love. If this be dissolved by fear or fraud, what is left but disunion? The Imperialism that stalks roughshod over the liberties of men is on the highway of wrong that leads to decay. Rome found this road, and it brought her to ruin. The true Imperialism is that which respects the rights of all, and gives his rights to each. Let this be the Imperialism of our future and our fame.

Gentlemen, it is a travesty to say that the race of Grotius does not understand the science of politics and the practice of law. It is needless for me to turn the pages of your Motley, and to cull the shining examples that he so gloriously depicted. The nation which refused to be conquered by Caesar---the people that first defined liberty, and that are the last to defend it---the nation whose proudest achievement is law---and that became the prototype of our own proud constitutional edifice---this race does not need a Chamberlain to define its political status.

If the Empire State leads all in jurisprudence, constitutional law, and political power, we must ascribe it to its sturdy founders---the old New York Dutch---from whose brothers, your cousins, the Boers, are the direct descendants.

And this is part of our American indebtedness to this grand old stock---and I wish to particularize, that all men

may know that the nation of Kruger has the genius of government:

From the Dutch we have directly and indirectly borrowed:

The principle that "all men are created equal;" Separation of Church and State; Freedom of Religion; Local self-government; Written Constitutions; Our Common School System; Freedom of the Press; the Secret written ballot; the Right of Counsel for defense; Our Supreme Court and the Supremacy of the Judiciary; Our State Senates and National Senate; Our State Governor and National President—the Statdholders of States and United States.

This is answer enough to the calumnies spread by British sympathizers.

The Transvaal promises to become the inheritor of Holland's splendid unfulfilled renown! And the world may once more behold a Dutch Republic—leader in law, and great in commerce—the refuge of the oppressed—and the home of freedom! A country where art and industry shall walk hand in hand, and where the genius of literature shall exalt the deeds of a daring race—a land that shall prove the quality of its founders and glorify the name of man.

And now, let me propose a toast to that greatest of modern Dutchmen, the William the Silent of South Africa—the most remarkable personality alive, Oom Paul Kruger.

What shall we say of this indomitable old hero—whose brawn built out of solid rock, is the bulwark against which the chosen legions of time's mightiest empire thunder in vain? There he stands, stern and immovable, as firm-fixed in belief and as deep-rooted in principle as that grand covenant of old, Oliver Cromwell! How can we magnify a Colossus, whose brain is the nerve center of South Africa, whose personality is so gigantic that it overshadows both friend and foe, whose will is the shaping policy of his country and the aspiration of his race.

Shrewd Old Kruger---that paradox of tyrant and patriot---that strange compound of worldliness and religion---that admirable mixture of soldier and statesman---that unrivalled diplomat and political gamester---that hopeful leader of a forlorn hope---the man of the hour, the cynosure of the world! Dear Oom Paul---admired by his enemies and loved by his people---he is the most unique figure of our time. If his nation win---his fame will stride progressively to the land of legend, where he will be given an honored place among the founders of nations---where his faults will be forgotten and his virtues exalted---where he will be among the noblest of the noble great!

But I for one prefer to contemplate him for what he is---a man of action and an actual man---one who, not devoid of fault, is splendid in virtue---one whose character evokes the homage of men, and moulds his age to approximate conformity. I hail Kruger---the man!

Watchman, what of the night? Is the magnificent conception of a United States of South Africa---that is become the dream of a struggling nation and the Shibboleth of their inspiration---doomed to sink into the blackness of annihilation? Or will it rise high in the firmament of political constellations---rise as we have risen, never to set---rise to shed the effulgence of hope and the light of liberty upon the benighted ones of earth?

Watchman, what of the night? Are the greed of gold and the ethics of the stock market to be the controlling forces of our time, and the keepers of the world's conscience? Is the unscrupulous vampire, glutted with blood, that now has fatsened itself upon the vitals of the little nation that it has sought out as its prey, to wax and fatten till all who now battle so gloriously in their country's defense, shall have been destroyed?

Watchman, what of the night? Are there no signs of the dawn that men have longed for, so long and so ardently?

That dawn that seemed so near when at the Conference at The Hague, Peace was trumpeted Empress of the World and Queen of Time. Is the smoke of battle never to lift---shall the cloud of war forever hide the face of the sun? Shall might always be right, and wrong ever be strong?

Friends, I believe the longed-for dawn is at hand. I believe that your brothers--bone of your bone---flesh of your flesh---in South Africa---will make the consummation nearer. They are perhaps solving the world riddle better than they know, as they break through the toils that the octopus of greed has woven around them. Like their forefathers and yours, they are the instruments that destiny has chosen for the accomplishment of a great work.

Their drums are beating the recession from the appalling decadence that is the tendency of our metropolitan civilization. They stand for the old principles of virtue and honesty---they are armed with the sword of justice and with the armor of righteousness---they are aglow with the ardor of faith, and they shall win. And their victory shall inaugurate a new century, and dedicate it to justice and to peace.





JOURNAL PRINT.  
JAMESTOWN, NEW YORK.  
1900.





